



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,004	04/06/2000	Asgeir Saebo	CONLINCO-04284	7988

23535 7590 06/25/2003
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
101 HOWARD STREET
SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WANG, SHENGJUN

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 06/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/544,004	SAEBO ET AL.	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Shengjun Wang	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears in the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Peri d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 and 37-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 and 20-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-19,24-35 and 37-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of applicants' amendments and remarks submitted April 14, 2003 is acknowledged.

Double Patenting Rejections

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 10-19, 24-34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2, 3 and 8-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,524,527. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims herein are generic to the claims in '527.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1617

2. Claims 1-5, 7-19, 24-35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Cook et al. (U.S. Patent 5,760,082, IDS) and Lievense et al. (U.S. patent 6,159,525) in view of Cain et al. (WO 97/18320, IDS) for reasons set forth in the prior office action. Newly added claim 39 is properly rejected over the cited prior art, since the employment of vitamin C stabilizes the CLA composition.

Response to the Arguments

Applicant's amendments and remarks submitted April 14, 2003 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive for reasons discussed below.

3. Applicants argue that a prima facie case has not been established because the cited references do not teach the limitation of VOC. The examiner disagrees. The instant invention claims a CLA composition, and food product containing the same which is the same as those disclosed in the cited references in all, but one respects, i.e., the negative limitation of VOC. As stated in the prior office action: "Regarding to the limitation about the amount of VOC, since the prior art teach that the food products containing CLA do not have any sensory property caused by VOC, the amount of VOC is reasonably believed to be very low. The amount of VOC claimed herein is either within the scope of the prior art, or an obvious variation of the prior art, lacking the criticality to the final products." Cited references teaches food product "comprising: a ingredient selected from the group consisting of a prepared conjugated linoleic acid, an ester thereof, a non-toxic salt thereof," (see the claims in '082). At the time the claimed invention was made, there is no teaching, suggestion, or general knowledge in the art that CLA has to be present or employed with the VOC herein defined. To the contrary, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ food grade CLA in food product, and avoid any CLA

Art Unit: 1617

composition containing smelly VOC. Applicants' assumption that CLA composition disclosed in the prior art inherently contains the VOC herein is without any factual support, and is improper.

4. The alleged evidences supporting the patentability have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

5. The specification discloses the removal of metal ions from CLA composition; the metal ions are alleged to be responsible for the decomposition of CLA, yielding the VOC components (see page 24 in the specification). First, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., removing metal ions from CLA composition) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993); Second, applicants again made an assumption that CLA composition known in the art inherently has the metal ions without factual support; Third, as shown in the specification, the VOC are accumulated in the CLA composition due to the decomposition. Therefore, a freshly made CLA composition is obviously free of the VOC, and therefor would meet the claimed limitation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-4554. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Application/Control Number: 09/544,004

Page 5

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Patent Examiner
S. J. WANG
Shengjun Wang
June 20, 2003